

27th August 1926]

Noes.

1. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.	13. Mr. S. Satyamurti.
2. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar.	14. T. Adinarayana Chettiar.
3. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.	15. Muhammad Mira Sahib.
4. P. Siva Rao.	16. G. Rameswara Rao.
5. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.	17. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.
6. A. Chidambara Nadar.	18. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.
7. M. Gangaraju.	19. Srinivas Sasibhusan Rath Mahasayo.
8. K. Gopala Menon.	20. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
9. K. Koti Reddi.	21. C. Y. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
10. P. Peddiraju.	22. B. Venkataratnam.
11. M. Sitayya.	23. J. Naganna Hegde.
12. P. C. Venkatapati Razu.	24. C. Venkataramam Nayudu.

Neutral.

Mr. L. K. Tulasiram.

Ayes 56. Noes 24. Neutral.

The motion was carried.

IV

DRAFT RULES UNDER SECTION 201 OF THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS
ACT, 1920.

I

The hon. the Raja of Panagal :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the resolution that stands in my name :—

‘ that the following draft rule proposed to be made by the Local Government under sub-section (1) of section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, altering rule 10 of Schedule II of the Act be approved :—

Draft rule.

‘ In exercise of the powers conferred on them by sub-section (1) of section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Local Government make the following rule altering rule 10 of Schedule II of the Act :—

‘ In sub-rule (1) of rule 10, after the words “ district gazette ” the words “ in English and in a vernacular language of the district ” shall be inserted.’

“ Sir, the present rule contained in Schedule II does not make any provision for the publication of the proceedings of the meetings of local boards in English and any one of the vernaculars. The old Act of 1884 contained the provision. The Select Committee which sat on the Bill of 1920 was asked to consider this question and they omitted it. But they gave no reason for the omission. In the District Municipalities Act we have the languages prescribed, that is, English and the language of the district. The object in introducing this change is to make good the omission and to bring this law into line with the District Municipalities Act.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro :—“ I beg to second the resolution.”

The resolution was put to the House and carried.

[27th August 1926

II

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"Sir, I beg to move the next resolution that stands against my name:—

'that the following draft of the rule proposed to be made by the Local Government under section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, altering rules 1 and 2 of Schedule II of that Act be approved:—

Draft rule.

'In exercise of the powers conferred on them by sub-section (1) of section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Local Government propose to make the following rules altering rules 1 and 2 of Schedule II of the said Act:—

'(1) At the end of rule 1 the following words shall be added, viz., "provided that no meeting shall be held on a Sunday."

'(2) In the first sentence of rule 2 between the words "specifies the day" and the word "when" the words "(not being a Sunday)" shall be inserted'.

"Sir, there is no specific provision in the rules in Schedule II to prohibit the holding of meetings on Sundays or holidays and the local boards hold their meetings sometimes on holidays. As hon. Members are aware, holidays are intended for taking rest. If the meetings are held on Sundays and other holidays, it would necessitate the attendance of the whole or part of the office and the object of having these holidays would be frustrated. On the other hand, the local boards think that it would be an advantage to them to hold the meetings on holidays. As a sort of compromise between the two positions it is considered that at least Sundays be left as days of rest which will be of some advantage to the officials. In these circumstances, the change is proposed to be made."

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"I beg to second the resolution."

Rao Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I have no quarrel with the latter portion of the resolution because when the day is sought to be specified it shall not be a Sunday. But as regards the first portion that no meeting shall be held on Sundays, I submit there is this difficulty. We generally hold meetings on the last Saturday of the month and supposing that several important subjects, such as, budget, administration reports, etc., have to be considered we find it difficult to finish the consideration of those subjects on that day and the members wish that the work left over might be disposed of the next morning so that they might go to their places. It is well known that the members are not paid daily allowances; they are paid only travelling allowances and if they are asked to stay and finish the work on Monday they go away. The work will thus suffer and it has to be postponed for two months. I submit that the provision that no meetings shall be held on Sundays will work great hardship on the administrative side of the local boards.

* p.m. "If the hon. the Chief Minister will see his way to so amend the rule that unless the meeting is continued on that day, with the consent of the members present on Saturday that they are prepared to work on Sunday, I submit, there will be no difficulty. If that is done, we can do the business

27th August 1926] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

more quickly. I quite see the solicitude on the part of the hon. Minister for the staff of local boards. They also want some rest, but I submit that very few clerks only are required on meeting days. It is only one or two clerks who are in charge of the meeting work that will be called for and if necessary they will be given compensation leave, i.e., if they work on a holiday, generally they are given compensation leave on some other day. We do not lose sight of that fact. Therefore my request to the hon. the Chief Minister is to alter the first portion in such a way as to provide that no meeting shall be held on a Sunday except when the meeting is to be continued on a Sunday with the consent of the members present."

Mr. T. M. Moide SAHIB :—“Not only on Sundays, but also on all Government holidays.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“Mr. President, Sir, I quite see that there is some force in the argument advanced by the hon. Member for Cuddapah, but I think I can easily answer the argument. The difficulty pointed out by the hon. Member is only in the case of meetings held on Saturdays and not on other days or other holidays. But when once a change is made and the boards are acquainted with the change, they will take care that on meetings convened on Saturdays they will not have a heavy programme of work. So, the objection urged by the hon. Member is not a serious one and it is left to the boards themselves to see that on such days there is a light programme. In these circumstances, I am sorry I cannot accept the proposal made by my hon. Friend.

“Again, Sir, the hon. Member for Malabar requested me to extend this to other holidays, but as I stated already, this decision was arrived at as a matter of compromise. I cannot accept his proposal.”

The resolution was put to the House and carried.

V
THE MALABAR TENANCY BILL.

* The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“So far as the Government are concerned, there is no objection to proceed with the non-official business if the House so desires.”

* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Three days have been allotted for non-official business. It is now 5 minutes after 4 and we may take it for all practical purposes as 4 o'clock and counting one hour for this day, three days will suffice for non-official business. I suppose, there is no objection to that.”

* The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“No objection.”

* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“The first thing for consideration is the preamble; section 1, section 2, the definition section, and sections 4 and 5 have then to be considered. We have finished section 3 and we have amendments to clause 1, clause 2 which deals with definitions and clauses 4 and 5. Amendments have already been tabled and we have also some amendments to clauses which have already been passed. I suggest, Sir, that it would be convenient to everybody concerned that we take up clauses 4 and 5 first and then clause 1 and then dispose of the amendments to clauses